

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No.785/MP/2025

Subject : Petition under Sections 63 and 79 of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Article 12 (Change in Law) of Transmission Service Agreement dated 24.08.2022 related to POWERGRID Neemuch Transmission System Limited.

Petitioner : POWERGRID Neemuch Transmission System Limited (PNTSL)

Respondents : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Co. Ltd. and Ors.

Date of Hearing : **23.6.2026**

Coram : Shri Jishnu Barua, Chairperson
Shri Ramesh Babu V, Member
Shri Harish Dudani, Member
Shri Ravinder Singh Dhillon, Member

Parties Present : Shri Shubham Arya, Advocate, PNTSL
Ms. Pallavi Saigal, Advocate, PNTSL
Ms. Kaavya Madaan, Advocate, PNTSL
Shri Prashant Kumar, PNTSL
Shri Akhil Hasija, Advocate, CSPDCL
Shri Rohan Mishra, Advocate, CSPDCL
Ms. Mahima Singh Kanwar, Advocate, CSPDCL
Shri Anup Jain, Advocate, MSEDCL
Shri Shashwat Dubey, Advocate, MSEDCL
Shri Rajiv Naik, Advocate, MSEDCL
Shri Saurabh Mishra, Advocate, MPPMCL
Ms. Prerna Priyadarshini, Advocate, CTUIL
Ms. Ayesha Choudhary, Advocate, CTUIL
Shri Akshayvat Kislay, CTUIL

Record of Proceedings

The learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the present Petition has been filed seeking approval of the cost overrun of Rs. 8.66 crore and consequent relief on account of Change in Law events in terms of the Transmission Service Agreement dated 24.8.2022, entered into between the Petitioner and the Respondent/CTUIL. The learned counsel submitted that the Respondents, MSEDCL, MPPMCL, and CSPDC, have already filed their replies, and the Petitioner has also filed its rejoinders thereto. Additionally, the Respondent/CTUIL also filed its reply on 19.6.2026, and the matter was ready for the final arguments.

2. The learned counsel for the Respondent/MSEDCL, however, submitted that MSEDCL, in its reply, has taken a plea that the change in the location of Neemuch S/s, claimed as a Change in Law by the Petitioner, was on account of the administrative decision of Respondent No.9/RUMSL and hence, any additional obligation/expenditure arising therefrom has to be borne by RUMSL and not by the other beneficiaries.



However, RUMSL has not filed any reply so far, and if deemed fit, another opportunity may be granted to RUMSL to file its reply, if any.

3. In response, the learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that RUMSL has been impleaded as Respondent in terms of the directions issued *vide* Record of Proceedings dated 6.11.2025, whereby all the Respondents, including RUMSL, were granted liberty to file their replies, if any.

4. Considering the above, the Commission deemed it appropriate to permit another opportunity to the Respondent/RUSML to file its reply, if any, within three weeks with a copy to the Petitioner, who may file its rejoinder(s), if any, within three weeks thereafter.

5. The Petition will be listed for hearing on **18.8.2026**.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-

(T.D. Pant)

Joint Chief (Law)